



LLW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| First Named<br>Inventor : Jesper Theil Hansen          |                      |
| Appln. No.: 10/663,341                                 | Group Art Unit: 2161 |
| Filed : September 15, 2003                             |                      |
| For : FREE TEXT SEARCH WITHIN A<br>RELATIONAL DATABASE | Examiner: Kim, Paul  |
| Docket No.: M61.12-0529                                |                      |

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING  
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450,  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, THIS

16<sup>th</sup> DAY OF June, 2006

  
PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 25, 2006. In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner restricted the claims to two species. The first species was indicated as claims 1-28 and the second species was indicated as claims 29-40. With this election, the Applicant elects, with traverse, the claims in species 1, that is claims 1-28.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner only restated the preamble of the claims for one of these alleged species, and a portion of the elements of the claims in the other alleged species. The Examiner did not provide any support for this assertion. In particular, the Examiner did not point to any figures or portions of the specification for the assertion that the claims were directed towards different species. The Examiner did not provide evidence or support that the two species have a separate classification in the Patent Office patent classification system. The Examiner did not provide evidence that each species has a separate status in the art. Nor did the Examiner provide any basis upon which one could determine that "an unduly extensive and burdensome search is necessary". Thus,

the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has failed to provide a prima facie case that the two species are independent or distinct as laid out and required in MPEP §808.02. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:



Nathan M. Rau, Reg. No. 45,466  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

NMR:mek